ESTTA Tracking number:

ESTTA552012 08/02/2013

Filing date:

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE THE TRADEMARK TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Proceeding	91211397
Party	Defendant Motorola Trademark Holdings, LLC
Correspondence Address	WILLIAM R. ANDERSON MOTOROLA TRADEMARK HOLDINGS, LLC 600 N US HIGHWAY 45 LIBERTYVILLE, IL 60048-5343 mxg674@motorola.com
Submission	Motion to Suspend for Civil Action
Filer's Name	Thomas M. Williams
Filer's e-mail	twilliams@ulmer.com, kevans@ulmer.com, jnew@ulmer.com
Signature	/s/ Thomas M. Williams
Date	08/02/2013
Attachments	Applicants Motion to Suspend Proceeding.pdf(1166414 bytes)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE THE TRADEMARK TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Application Serial No. 85/792,653)
Filed: December 3, 2012)
Published: March 5, 2013, in the Official Gazette	
For: MAXXCHARGE)
)
Mag Instrument, Inc.)
) Opposition No. 91/211,397
Opposer,)
)
VS.)
Motorola Trademark Holdings, LLC)
Applicant.)
)

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Trademark Trial and Appeal Board P.O. Box 1451 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1451

APPLICANT'S MOTION TO SUSPEND PROCEEDING PURSUANT TO CIVIL ACTION

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 2.117(a) and T.B.M.P. § 510.02(a), Applicant Motorola Trademark Holdings, LLC ("Applicant") hereby notifies the Board that Applicant is engaged in a civil action that may have a bearing on the case. Applicant requests the Board to suspend this proceeding pending resolution of the civil action. In support, Applicant states as follows:

1. On March 11, 2013, third parties Waves Audio Ltd. and Waves Inc. (collectively, "Waves") filed a trademark infringement Complaint in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California against Applicant and its related entity Motorola Mobility LLC.

See Waves Audio Ltd. and Waves Inc. v. Motorola Mobility LLC and Motorola Trademark

Holdings, LLC, Case No. 13-CV-1091 (EMC)¹ (N.D. Cal.) (the "Civil Action"). A copy of the Complaint is attached as Exhibit 1.

- 2. The Complaint in the Civil Action alleges that Applicant's use of "colorable imitations" of Waves' asserted trademarks MAXX, MAXXAUDIO, MAXXBASS, and MAXXVOLUME is likely to cause confusion. (Ex. 1, Complaint at ¶ 50.) The Complaint expressly identifies Applicant's co-pending MAXX trademark application covering "mobile phones, smartphones, and accessories therefor, namely, power adapters" (Ser. No. 85/792,643). (Ex. 1, Complaint at ¶ 43.) The Complaint alleges trademark infringement and unfair competition under the Lanham Act, as well as related state law claims. Among other relief, Waves seeks an injunction against Applicant's use of the MAXX trademark. (Ex. 1, Complaint at pp. 13-14.)
- 3. Upon Applicant's motion, and based upon the Civil Action, the Board suspended a co-pending opposition proceeding filed by Waves against Applicant's application to register the MAXX trademark for use in connection with "mobile phones, smartphones, and accessories therefor, namely, power adapters" (Ser. No. 85/792,643). *See Waves Audio Ltd. v. Motorola Trademark Holdings, LLC*, T.T.A.B. Case No. 91/209,701 at Dkt. #8 (Order suspending proceedings dated May 14, 2013).
- 4. The applied-for trademark at issue in this proceeding (Case No. 91/211,397) is MAXXCHARGE covering "mobile phones, smartphones and accessories therefor, namely, power adapters" (Ser. No. 85/792,653). These goods are identical to the goods at issue in Waves' Civil Action, in which Waves seeks an injunction against Applicant's use of the MAXX

¹ The Civil Action was subsequently reassigned to a new judge. Consequently, the new case number is 13-CV-1091 (WHO).

trademark and "colorable imitations" of Waves' asserted trademarks.² As a result, the Civil Action may have a bearing on the above-captioned proceeding.

In light of the foregoing, suspension is proper. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 2.117(a), T.B.M.P. § 510.02(a). As set forth in the Board Manual, "[P]ursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 2.117(a), the Board may also, in its discretion, suspend a proceeding pending the final determination of another Board proceeding ... or even another proceeding in which only one of the parties is involved." T.B.M.P. § 510.02(a). "Ordinarily, the Board will suspend proceedings in the case before it if the final determination of the other proceeding may have a bearing on the issues before the Board." *Id.* The other proceeding need not be dispositive, but only needs to have a bearing on the issues. *Id.* (citing *New Orleans Louisiana Saints LLC v. Who Dat? Inc.*, 99 U.S.P.Q.2d 1550, 1552 (T.T.A.B. 2011)).

Although the plaintiffs in the Civil Action, Waves Audio Ltd. and Waves Inc., are not parties to this opposition, suspension is still proper. *See Argo & Co., Inc. v. Carpetsheen Mfg., Inc.*, 187 U.S.P.Q. 366 (T.T.A.B. 1975). Applicant is a defendant in each of the pending proceedings described above, including the Civil Action. The district court's ruling with respect to the "MAXX" trademark may be binding on the Board. *See New Orleans Louisiana Saints*, 99 U.S.P.Q.2d at 1552. As a result, the Civil Action may have a bearing on these proceedings. If the Civil Action plaintiffs' claims are ultimately successful—which Applicant will vigorously contest—Applicant may be enjoined from using a "MAXX"-formative trademark in connection with the applied-for goods. If that occurs, Applicant would be unable to perfect use of the applied-for MAXXCHARGE mark and the application at issue in this proceeding would ultimately go abandoned.

⁻

² These goods are also identical to the goods at issue in Waves' now-suspended MAXX trademark opposition proceeding (Case No. 91/209,701).

If the district court issues an injunction in the Civil Action, there may be no need to

proceed with this opposition. Conversely, if the district court dismisses Waves' claims, this

opposition can proceed. Consequently, Applicant respectfully requests the Board to suspend

proceedings pending the outcome of the Civil Action. See General Motors Corp. v. Cadillac

Club Fashions Inc., 22 U.S.P.Q.2d 1933, 1937 (T.T.A.B. 1992) (granting motion to suspend). In

the event the Board denies Applicant's Motion to Suspend, Applicant respectfully requests the

Board to reset Applicant's deadline to file an Answer or otherwise plead.

Dated: August 2, 2013 BY:

ULMER & BERNE, LLP

BY: <u>/s/ Thomas M. Williams</u>

Thomas M. Williams

500 W. Madison St., Suite 3600

Chicago, IL 60661

Telephone: (312) 658-6500 Facsimile: (312) 658-6501

twilliams@ulmer.com Attorney for Applicant

Motorola Trademark Holdings, LLC

4

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

On August 2, 2013, I served the foregoing APPLICANT'S MOTION TO SUSPEND

PROCEEDING PURSUANT TO CIVIL ACTION on the parties in said action by depositing

a true copy thereof with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, postage prepaid, at

Chicago, Illinois, enclosed in a sealed envelope addressed to counsel of record for Opposer as

follows:

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP

Robert W. Dickerson Charles A. Kertell

2 Park Plaza, Suite 900

Irvine, CA 92614

Tel: (949) 623-7882

dickersonr@discksteinshapiro.com

kertellc@dicksteinshapiro.com

Dated: August 2, 2013

By:

/s/ Thomas M. Williams

Thomas M. Williams

5

EXHIBIT 1

. 6. 3

J. Scott Denko (Texas State Bar No. 00792457) (Pro Hac Vice Pending) Bradley D. Coburn (Texas State Bar No. 24036377) (Pro Hac Vice Pending) R. Floyd Walker (Texas State Bar No. 24044751) (Pro Hac Vice Pending) Sherri A. Wilson (Texas State Bar No. 24075291) (Pro Hac Vice Pending) DENKO COBURN LAUFF LLP 1501 S. MoPac Expy., Suite A315 Austin, TX 78746 Telephone: (512) 906-2074 5 Facsimile: (512) 906-2075 Filed Email: denko@dcllegal.com coburn@dcllegal.com 6 walker@dcllegal.com MAR I 1 2013 wilson@dcllegal.com 7 RICHARD W. WIEKING CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN JOSE 8 Perry R. Clark (California Bar No. 197101) LAW OFFICES OF PERRY R. CLARK 825 San Antonio Road Palo Alto, CA 94303 Telephone: (650) 248-5817 10 Facsimile: (650) 618-8533 Email: perry@perryclarklaw.com 11 Counsel for Plaintiffs WAVES AUDIO LTD., AND 12 WAVES INC. 13 14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 15 SAN JOSE DIVISION 16 1091 WAVES AUDIO LTD. AND WAVES INC.,) 17 **Plaintiffs** PLAINTIFFS' ORIGINAL COMPLAINT 18 vs. 19 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL** MOTOROLA MOBILITY LLC AND MOTOROLA TRADEMARK HOLDINGS,) 20 LLC, 21 **Defendants** 22 23 24

PLAINTIFFS' ORIGINAL COMPLAINT

EMC

This is a lawsuit by Waves Audio Ltd. and Waves Inc. (collectively "Waves") for relief from trademark infringement, dilution and other unlawful acts of Motorola Mobility LLC and Motorola Trademark Holdings, LLC (collectively "Motorola"). Motorola unlawfully, willfully and without authorization has used and continues to use Waves' registered trademark "MAXX" on Motorola's mobile phones. Motorola's conduct has tarnished the mark MAXX and its related trademark family and harmed the reputation of Waves.

PARTIES

- 1. Waves Inc. is a corporation organized under the laws of Delaware. Its principal place of business is 2800 Merchants Drive, Knoxville, TN 37912.
- Waves Audio Ltd. is a company organized under the laws of Israel. Its principal place of business is Azrieli Center 3, The Triangle Tower, 32nd Floor, Tel-Aviv 67023 Israel.
 - 3. Waves Inc. is a wholly owned subsidiary of Waves Audio Ltd.
- 4. Upon information and belief, Motorola Mobility LLC is a limited liability corporation organized under the laws of Delaware with its principal place of business at 600 North U.S. Highway 45, Libertyville, Illinois 60048.
- 5. Upon Information and belief, Motorola Trademark Holdings, LLC is a limited liability corporation organized under the laws of Delaware with its principal place of business at 600 North U.S. Highway 45, Libertyville, Illinois 60048.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 6. This court possess subject matter jurisdiction under 15 U.S.C. § 1121 and 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1332, 1338(a) and (b), and 1367.
- 7. Personal jurisdiction is proper in this district because Motorola has solicited and conducted business within the State of California via its marketing and sales of infringing PLAINTIFFS' ORIGINAL COMPLAINT

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

devices and acts of dilution. Motorola Mobility LLC also maintains an office at 1000 Enterprise Way, Sunnyvale, CA 94089. Motorola Mobility LLC regularly conducts business within the State of California. Motorola's products have been inserted into the stream of commerce and directed towards California, amongst other places. Defendants' wrongful actions have damaged Waves within the State of California.

Venue is proper in this district under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2), (c)(2), and(d) 8. because a substantial part of the acts giving rise to this cause of action occurred within this judicial district, and Motorola's contacts are sufficient to subject it to personal jurisdiction in this district.

INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT

9. Per Civil L.R. 3-2(c), this intellectual property action shall be assigned on a district-wide basis.

BACKGROUND

- Waves is the world's leading developer and supplier of software-based audio 10. signal processing tools and hardware-based products. Waves itself has become synonymous with top-of-the-line audio processing, and the company's products are used where superior sound quality is a prerequisite, such as hit records, major motion pictures, and top-selling games worldwide.
- In consumer electronics applications, Waves provides various goods and 11. services that compensate for the acoustic quality limitations of small, power efficient speakers systems found in today's most popular consumer products such as LCD TVs, notebook PCs, portable speaker systems, mobile phones, and smart phones.
- In addition to its own goods and services, Waves' technologies provide custom 12. semiconductor and digital signal processing solutions to some of the most important audio and PLAINTIFFS' ORIGINAL COMPLAINT

consumer electronics firms in the world including Altec Lansing, Audio Products International,

2

3

4 5

6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

- Clarion, JVC, Microsoft, Samsung, Sanyo, and Sony. 13. Waves owns the following trademarks registered in International Class 9 on the Principal Register of the Federal Trademark Register of the United States: MAXX,
- MAXXBASS, MAXXAUDIO, MAXXVOLUME ("Waves' Registered Marks").
- 14. Waves filed U.S. Trademark Application Serial No. 85/656,250 seeking to register its MAXXVOICE mark ("Waves' Application Mark") in International Class 9 for "software and hardware for voice enhancement in mobile phones, computers, smart phones and VoIP."
- In addition to the goodwill resulting from Waves' use of its registered marks, 15. Waves owns common law trademark rights and associated good will in its MAXX, MAXXBASS, MAXXAUDIO, MAXXVOLUME, and MAXXVOICE marks based on widespread use of those marks on consumer electronics and other sound-generating products ("Waves' Common-Law Marks").
- Waves' Registered Marks, Application Mark, and Common-Law Marks 16. (collectively, "Waves' Marks" or "the Waves Marks") are composed and used in such a way that the public associates not only those marks, but the common characteristic "MAXX" of the family, with Waves. Because Waves' Marks form a group of marks having a recognizable common characteristic MAXX, they constitute a protectable family of marks ("Waves' MAXX Family of Marks").
- The "MAXX" trademark was registered on Mar. 21, 2006 under Reg. No. 17. 3,070,047 and was first used in commerce at least as early as November 12, 1997. This mark is incontestable, which, pursuant to Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1115, conclusively establishes both Waves' exclusive right to use this mark in commerce and its validity. A copy of this PLAINTIFFS' ORIGINAL COMPLAINT

PLAINTIFFS' ORIGINAL COMPLAINT

registration is attached hereto as **Exhibit A**.

- 18. The "MAXX" trademark has been registered for use with, among other things, software for control, conditioning and modification of sound for use in audio applications and technologies to improve sound quality and audio system design and computer and electronics hardware.
- 19. The "MAXXAUDIO" trademark was registered on April 5, 2011 under Reg. No. 3,941,010 and was first used in commerce at least as early as August 31, 2007. This mark is incontestable, which, pursuant to Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1115, conclusively establishes both Waves' exclusive right to use this mark in commerce and its validity. A copy of this registration is attached hereto as **Exhibit B**.
- 20. The "MAXXAUDIO" mark has been registered for use with, amongst other things, portable audio appliances including mp3 players.
- 21. The "MAXXBASS" trademark was registered on June 1, 2004 under Reg. No. 2,847,596 and was first used in commerce at least as early as April 17, 1998. The mark is incontestable, which, pursuant to Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1115, conclusively establishes both Waves' exclusive right to use this mark in commerce and its validity. A copy of this registration is attached hereto as **Exhibit C**.
- 22. The "MAXXBASS" mark has been registered for use with, amongst other things, portable audio appliances including mp3 players.
- 23. The "MAXXVOLUME" trademark was registered on Apr. 28, 2009 under Reg. No. 3,612,855 and was first used in commerce at least as early as April 30, 2007. This mark is incontestable, which, pursuant to Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1115, conclusively establishes both Waves' exclusive right to use this mark in commerce and its validity. A copy of this registration is attached hereto as **Exhibit D**.

- 24. The "MAXXVOLUME" mark has been registered for use with, amongst other things, portable audio appliances including mp3 players.
- 25. Waves' Marks and MAXX Family of Marks are associated with the high quality audio functionality provided by Waves.
- 26. Waves has won many awards for its products, including, but not limited to, a prestigious 2011 Technical GRAMMY® Award for its innovative professional music production software.
- 27. Millions of laptop computers and other sound producing consumer electronic devices have been distributed across the United States (including in California) bearing one or more of Waves' Marks.
- 28. Waves' mark MAXX and Waves' MAXX Family of Marks are famous in California.
- 29. Motorola markets and has marketed mobile phone products under the names "DROID RAZR MAXX" and "DROID RAZR MAXX HD."
- 30. The DROID RAZR MAXX and DROID RAZR MAXX HD have the capability and are regularly used by consumers to produce sound from mp3 files.
- 31. The capability to play mp3 files as well as other audio formats is advertised by Motorola as a feature of the DROID RAZR MAXX and DROID RAZR MAXX HD.
- 32. The DROID RAZR MAXX and DROID RAZR MAXX HD have become associated with poor audio quality.
- 33. The poor quality of the sound reproduction in the DROID RAZR MAXX and DROID RAZR MAXX HD mobile phones has tarnished and will continue to tarnish the value of the Waves' Marks and Waves' reputation with respect to high quality audio reproduction.

- 34. Motorola's use of the terms "DROID RAZR" and "DROID RAZR MAXX" is likely to give the false impression that a distinguishing feature between these products is endorsement by Waves. The relevant public is likely to believe that the "DROID RAZR MAXX" is endorsed by Waves while the "DROID RAZR" has no such endorsement.
- 35. Waves has no involvement with the audio or sound problems of the DROID RAZR MAXX or DROID RAZR MAXX HD
- 36. Waves' MAXXAUDIO product is used by cellular telephone manufacturers other than Motorola to improve the audio quality of their phones.
- 37. Motorola's use of the "MAXX" mark in connection with its products is likely to impede Waves' ability to market its MAXX products to other cellular telephone manufactures.
- 38. Motorola's use of Waves' Marks in connection with inferior products will discourage other mobile telephone manufacturers and sellers from adopting and advertising the use of Waves' products as a feature of their mobile telephones and electronic products.

MOTOROLA'S WILLFUL CONDUCT

- 39. Waves informed Motorola of its trademark infringement of the Waves' trademark MAXX on March 29, 2012.
- 40. Motorola became aware of the likelihood of confusion caused by its use of the "MAXX" mark in relation to its products no later than March 29, 2012.
- 41. Despite being made aware of the likelihood of confusion, in a letter dated April 20, 2012 and signed by David C. Carroll, Motorola stated that it would continue to use the "MAXX" mark in conjunction with its mobile phones and alleged that its use of the term "MAXX" was merely descriptive.
- 42. After being informed of the likelihood of confusion and despite contending to Waves that its use of the mark MAXX was merely descriptive, Motorola went on to file an PLAINTIFFS' ORIGINAL COMPLAINT

2012.43. Motorola's trademark application for the mark "MAXX" was assigned serial

application for registration of the mark "MAXX" on the Principal Trademark Register of the

United States. That application was signed by David C. Carroll and filed on December 3,

- number 85/792,643. A copy of this application is attached hereto as **Exhibit E**.
- 44. Motorola filed its trademark application with full knowledge and in flagrant disregard of Waves' trademark rights. Despite that knowledge, Motorola declared to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office that, to the best of its knowledge and belief, "no other person, firm, corporation, or association has the right to use the mark in commerce, either in the identical form thereof or in such near resemblance thereto as to be likely, when used on or in connection with the goods/services of such other person, to cause confusion, or to cause mistake, or to deceive." And despite claiming to Waves that its use of the term MAXX is descriptive, the application filing demonstrates Motorola's belief that the mark is registrable to Motorola on the principal register in International Class 9, the same class to which the Waves' Marks are registered.
- 45. On January 7, 2013, Waves again notified Motorola by letter of its unlawful conduct regarding Waves' trademark rights, including but not limited to, trademark infringement.
- 46. On January 14, 2013, Motorola affirmed by response letter its intention to continue to use the "MAXX" mark without regard to Waves' trademark rights while also omitting to mention that following Waves' March 2012 notification Motorola applied to register the mark "MAXX" for its own purposes.

COUNT 1 – FEDERAL TRADEMARK INFRINGEMENT

47. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference herein the allegations contained in PLAINTIFFS' ORIGINAL COMPLAINT

paragraphs 1 through 46 of this Complaint.

- 48. Defendant's aforementioned acts constitute trademark infringement in violation of section 32(1) of the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1114(1).
- 49. Waves' federal registrations on the Principal Register for the marks MAXX, MAXXAUDIO, MAXXBASS, and MAXXVOLUME are incontestable pursuant to the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1115. Incontestability is conclusive evidence of their validity, Waves' ownership of the marks and of Waves' exclusive right to use the marks in commerce in connection with the goods and services specified in the certificates of registration under 15 U.S.C. § 1115(b).
- 50. Defendants are intentionally and wrongfully using in commerce unauthorized reproductions, counterfeits, copies, and colorable imitations of Waves' Registered Marks in connection with the sale, offering for sale, distribution, and advertising of Defendants' mobile phone products, with full knowledge that such marks and designations are counterfeit marks. Such uses are likely to cause confusion, or to cause mistake, or to deceive, including, without limitation, by being likely to cause confusion as to sponsorship or authorization by Waves, or alternatively, by destroying the origin-identifying function of MAXX and other of the Waves Marks. Defendants' actions constitute trademark infringement in violation of section 32(1) of the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1114(1).
- 51. Defendants became aware of Waves' ownership of the Waves Marks including MAXX no later than March 29, 2012.
- 52. Defendants have made extensive use of the mark MAXX in the promotion of their products.
- 53. The foregoing acts of infringement have been and continue to be deliberate, willful, and wanton, making this an exceptional case within the meaning of 15 U.S.C. § 1117. PLAINTIFFS' ORIGINAL COMPLAINT

- 54. Defendants' sales and marketing of the DROID RAZR MAXX and DROID RAZR MAXX HD will likely continue unless enjoined by this Court.
- 55. As a proximate result of Motorola's actions, Waves has suffered and will continue to suffer substantial damage to its business, goodwill, reputation, profits, and the strength of its trademarks. The injury to Waves is ongoing and irreparable.
- 56. An award of monetary damages alone cannot fully compensate Waves for its injuries, and Waves lacks an adequate remedy at law.
- 57. Waves is entitled to a permanent injunction against Defendants, as well as all other remedies available under the Lanham Act, including, but not limited to, damages sustained by the Plaintiffs, treble damages, disgorgement of Defendants' profits, and costs and attorneys' fees.

COUNT 2 – FEDERAL UNFAIR COMPETITION, FALSE DESIGNATION OF ORIGIN, PASSING OFF AND FALSE ADVERTISING

- 58. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference herein the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 57 of this Complaint.
- 59. The Waves' Marks are used by Waves in connection with providing high quality goods and services and are distinctive marks that have become associated with Waves and thus exclusively identify Wave's business, products, and services.
- 60. Defendants are intentionally and wrongfully using unauthorized reproductions, counterfeits, copies, and colorable imitations of Waves' Marks in commerce on and in connection with Defendants' mobile phone products, resulting in false designations of origin, false and misleading descriptions of fact, and false and misleading representations of fact that are likely to cause confusion, to cause mistake, and to deceive as to the affiliation, connection, or association of Defendants with Waves and as to the origin, sponsorship, or approval of PLAINTIFFS' ORIGINAL COMPLAINT

Defendants' mobile phone products and commercial activities by Waves, and that misrepresents the nature, characteristics, and qualities Defendants' mobile phone products and commercial activities, in violation of section 43(a) of the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a). For example, consumers are deceptively led to believe that the DROID RAZR MAXX and DROID RAZR MAXX HD are sponsored by or otherwise approved by Waves, or alternatively, that the Waves Marks are associated with poor audio functionality, thus destroying the goodwill and value of Waves and the Waves Marks.

- 61. The foregoing acts and conduct by Defendants constitute false designation of origin and false advertising in connection with products and services distributed in interstate commerce, in violation of section 43(a) of the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a).
- 62. Defendants' acts, as set forth above, have caused irreparable injury to Waves' goodwill and reputation. The injury to Waves is ongoing and irreparable.
- 63. Defendants' sales and marketing of the DROID RAZR MAXX and DROID RAZR MAXX HD will likely continue unless enjoined by this Court.
- 64. Waves is entitled to a permanent injunction against Defendants, as well as all other remedies available under the Lanham Act, including, but not limited to, compensatory damages, treble damages, disgorgement of profits, and costs and attorney's fees.
- 65. An award of monetary damages alone cannot fully compensate Waves for its injuries and Waves lacks an adequate remedy at law.

COUNT 3 – INJUNCTION AGAINST USE OF FAMOUS MARK UNDER CAL. BUS. & PROFESSIONS CODE § 14427

66. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference herein the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 65 of this Complaint.

9

12

11

14

15

13

16

17 18

19 20

21 22

23

24 PLAINTIFFS' ORIGINAL COMPLAINT

67.	The	Waves	Marks	are	famous	and	protectal	ole ma	arks i	in	California	and,	on
nformation	and be	lief, Pla	intiffs'	prot	ected in	terest	in those	mark	s aros	se 1	before De	fenda	nts'
use of those	marke												

- 68. Waves has no control over the qualities, or lack thereof, of Defendants' DROID RAZR MAXX and DROID RAZR MAXX HD products, its advertising and other promotional materials related thereto, or is unauthorized use of the Waves Marks. As a result of such use by Motorola, the business reputation of Waves as well as its MAXX Family of Marks is being tarnished, and such tarnishing will continue unless stopped by this Court.
- Defendants' sales and marketing of the DROID RAZR MAXX and DROID 69. RAZR MAXX HD and its use of and dissemination of materials bearing the Waves' Marks is and will continue to result in the dilution of the distinctive nature of the Waves' Marks through blurring.
- 70. Defendants' wrongful conduct constitutes an extreme threat to the distinctiveness of the Waves Marks that Waves has expended great efforts to develop and maintain through its strict control over the usage of the Waves Marks.
- The Waves Marks are distinctive and of high value and they and the business 71. reputation of Waves with which they are associated has suffered and will continue to suffer irreparable harm by such blurring and tarnishing if Defendants' wrongful conduct is allowed to continue.
- Defendants' acts, as set forth above, have caused irreparable injury to the 72. distinctive quality of Waves' Marks and the MAXX Family of Marks as well as Waves' business reputation. This injury is ongoing and irreparable.
- Defendants' sales and marketing of the DROID RAZR MAXX and DROID 73. RAZR MAXX HD will likely continue unless enjoined by this Court.

5

8

11 12

10

13 14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21 22

23 24

74. Waves is entitled to a permanent injunction against Defendants consistent with California Business and Professions Code Section 14247.

COUNT 4 – UNFAIR COMPETITION UNDER CAL. BUS. & PROFESSIONS **CODE § 17200 ET SEQ.**

- Plaintiffs incorporate by reference herein the allegations contained in 75. paragraphs 1 through 74 of this Complaint.
- Defendants have committed trademark infringement and other unlawful acts as 76. set forth above in violation of plaintiffs' proprietary rights in the Waves Marks. Such acts constitute unfair trade practices and unfair competition under California Business and Professions Code § 17200 et seq., and under the common law of the State of California, entitling plaintiffs to relief.
- Pursuant to California Business and Professions Code § 17203, Defendants' are 77. required to disgorge and restore to plaintiffs all profits and property acquired by means of Defendants' unfair competition.
- Due to the Defendants' conduct, Plaintiffs have suffered irreparable harm, 78. suffered injury in fact, and have lost money or property as a result of Defendants' acts of unfair business practices alleged herein. It would be difficult to ascertain the amount of money damages that would afford plaintiff adequate relief at law for Defendants' acts. Plaintiffs' remedy at law is not adequate to compensate it for its injuries. Accordingly, Plaintiffs are entitled to relief pursuant to California Business and Professions Code § 17203.
- On information and belief, Defendants' conduct has been intentional and willful 79. and in conscious disregard of plaintiff's rights and, therefore, Plaintiffs are entitled to their attorneys' fees.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Plaintiffs respectfully request this Court to enter judgment in their favor against Defendant granting the following relief:

- A. That Defendants and those persons and entities in concert or participation with Defendants, and their respective affiliates, successors, and assigns along with the directors, officers, agents, servants, and employees thereof be permanently enjoined from:
 - 1. Using any of the Waves Marks in conjunction with the promotion, marketing, and advertising of any product with audio capabilities;
 - 2. Diluting, tarnishing, blurring, and infringing the Waves' Marks and from injuring Waves' goodwill and reputation;
 - Passing off or falsely designating the origin of Defendants' products as those of Plaintiffs;
 - Doing any other act likely to induce the belief that Motorola products are in any way connected with, sponsored, affiliated, licensed, or endorsed by Waves.
 - 5. Using any of the Waves Marks for goods or services, or on the internet or as domain names, email addresses, meta tags, invisible data or otherwise engaging in acts or conduct that would cause confusion as to the source, sponsorship or affiliation of Defendants with Waves.
- B. That Defendants in accordance with 15 U.S.C. § 1116(a), be directed to file with this court and serve upon Waves within thirty days after service of the permanent injunction a report in writing under oath, setting forth in detail the manner and form in which Defendants have complied with the permanent injunction;

PLAINTIFFS' ORIGINAL COMPLAINT

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- C. That Defendants be ordered to deliver an accounting to Plaintiffs within thirty days of the entry of judgment;
- D. That Defendants be ordered to deliver up for destruction all labels, signs, prints, packages, wrappers, receptacles, and advertisements in their possession that bear any of Waves' Marks or any reproduction, counterfeit, copy, or colorable imitation thereof, and all plates, molds, matrices, and other means of making the same.
- E. That Waves recovers its actual damages sustained as a result of Defendants' wrongful actions or, if so elected by Plaintiffs, statutory damages under 15 U.S.C. § 1117(d);
- F. That Defendants shall disgorge to Waves its profits made as a result of Defendants' wrongful actions;
- G. That Waves recover three times Defendants' profits made as a result of Defendants' wrongful actions or three times Waves' damages, whichever is greater;
- H. That this case be deemed an exceptional case under 15 U.S.C. §§ 1117(a) and (b) and that Defendants be deemed liable for and ordered to reimburse Waves for its reasonable attorneys' fees;
- I. That Waves be awarded exemplary damages for Defendants' willful and intentional acts;
 - J. That Waves recover its costs of this action;
- K. That Waves recover all prejudgment and postjudgment interest as allowed by law; and
 - L. That Waves recover such further relief as may be just and proper.

24

Dated: 3/11/13

Respectfully Submitted,

J. Scott Denko (pro hac vice pending)
(Texas State Bar No. 00792457)
Bradley D. Coburn (pro hac vice pending)
(Texas State Bar No. 24036377)
R. Floyd Walker (pro hac vice pending)
(Texas State Bar No. 24044751)

Sherri A Wilson (pro hac vice pending) (Texas State Bar No. 24075291) DENKO COBURN LAUFF LLP

1501 S. MoPac Expy, Suite A315 Austin, TX 78746

Telephone: (512) 906-2074 Facsimile: (512) 906-2075 Email: denko@dcllegal.com coburn@dcllegal.com walker@dcllegal.com

Perry R. Clark (California Bar No. 197101) LAW OFFICES OF PERRY R. CLARK 825 San Antonio Road

Palo Alto, CA 94303 Telephone: (650) 248-5817 Facsimile: (650) 618-8533

Email: perry@perryclarklaw.com

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFFS

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiffs demand a jury trial for all issues triable by jury.

Dated: 3/11/15

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Respectfully Submitted,

J Scott Denko (pro hac vice pending)
(Texas State Bar No. 00792457)
Bradley D. Coburn (pro hac vice pending)
(Texas State Bar No. 24036377)
R. Floyd Walker (pro hac vice pending)
(Texas State Bar No. 24044751)
Sherri A Wilson (pro hac vice pending)
(Texas State Bar No. 24075291)
DENKO COBURN LAUFF LLP
1501 S. MoPac Expy, Suite A315
Austin, TX 78746

Telephone: (512) 906-2074
Facsimile: (512) 906-2075
Email: denko@dcllegal.com

coburn@dcllegal.com walker@dcllegal.com

Perry R. Clark (California Bar No. 197101) LAW OFFICES OF PERRY R. CLARK 825 San Antonio Road

Palo Alto, CA 94303 Telephone: (650) 248-5817 Facsimile: (650) 618-8533

Email: perry@perryclarklaw.com

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFFS

PLAINTIFFS' ORIGINAL COMPLAINT

16

EXHIBIT A

Int. Cl.: 9

Prior U.S. Cls.: 21, 23, 26, 36 and 38

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Reg. No. 3,070,047 Registered Mar. 21, 2006

TRADEMARK PRINCIPAL REGISTER

MAXX

WAVES AUDIO LTD. (ISRAEL CORPORATION) AZRIELI CENTER 1 ROUND BUILDING, 132 DE RECHPETACH-TIK-VA TEL AVIV, ISRAEL 67021

FOR: COMPUTER SOFTWARE FOR CONTROL, CONDITIONING AND MODIFICATION OF ELECTRONIC WAVEFORMS REPRESENTATIVE OF HUMAN-SENSIBLE SOUND FOR USE IN AUDIO APPLICATIONS AND TECHNOLOGIES TO IM-

PROVE SOUND QUALITY AND AUDIO SYSTEM DESIGN, AND COMPUTER AND ELECTRONICS HARDWARE THEREFOR, IN CLASS 9 (U.S. CLS. 21, 23, 26, 36 AND 38).

FIRST USE 11-6-1997; IN COMMERCE 11-12-1997.

SER. NO. 78-199,177, FILED 12-31-2002.

BARBARA GAYNOR, EXAMINING ATTORNEY

EXHIBIT B

United States of America United States Patent and Trademark Office

MAXXAUDIO

Reg. No. 3,941,010 WAVES AUDIO LTD. (ISRAEL AZRIELI CENTER, TRIANGLI 132 DERECH PETACH-TIKVA

Int. Cl.: 9

TRADEMARK

PRINCIPAL REGISTER

WAVES AUDIO LTD. (ISRAEL CORPORATION) AZRIELI CENTER, TRIANGLE TOWER, 32ND FLR 132 DERECH PETACH-TIKVA TEL AVIV, ISRAEL 67021

FOR: SOFTWARE AND ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT FOR PROCESSING, TRANSMITTING, RECEIVING AND REPRODUCING AUDIO SIGNALS IN ORDER TO ENHANCE BASS QUALITIES, NAMELY, DIGITAL AUDIO WORK STATIONS CONSISTING OF COMPUTER HARDWARE AND SOFTWARE FOR REPRODUCING AUDIO SIGNALS IN ORDER TO ENHANCE BASS QUALITIES; DIGITAL AND ANALOG AUDIO MIXING CONSOLES; HOME AUDIO APPLIANCES, NAMELY, RADIOS, TELEVISION SETS, STEREO SYSTEMS AND MINI STEREO SYSTEMS CONSISTING OF AUDIO AMPLIFIERS, TUNERS, RECEIV-ERS, AND CD AND AUDIO TAPE PLAYERS, AND VIDEO CASSETTE PLAYERS, PORTABLE AUDIO APPLIANCES, NAMELY, RADIOS AND MP3 PLAYERS; MAGNETIC AND OPTICAL MEDIA CARRYING AUDIO SIGNALS THAT WERE SUBJECT TO BASS ENHANCEMENT, NAMELY, RECORDS, CD'S, AUDIO TAPES, AND MINI-DISKS FEATURING MUSICAL SOUND RECORDINGS; ELECTRONIC PROCESSORS FOR USE IN THE REPRODUCTION OF RECORDED SOUND OR STREAMING OF SOUND; SOUND RECORDINGS EMBODYING ENCODED INFORMATION FEATURING MUSICAL PERFORMANCES; KIT FOR THE SELF-LEARNING OF RECORDING, PROCESSING, RESTORING, MIXING AND MASTERING OF AUDIO CONTENT, SAID KIT COMPRISING PRE-RECORDED INSTRUCTIONAL CD'S AND DVD'S AND ASSOCIATED MANUALS, IN CLASS 9 (U.S. CLS. 21, 23, 26, 36 AND 38).

FIRST USE 8-31-2007; IN COMMERCE 8-31-2007.

THE MARK CONSISTS OF STANDARD CHARACTERS WITHOUT CLAIM TO ANY PARTICULAR FONT, STYLE, SIZE, OR COLOR.

OWNER OF U.S. REG. NOS. 2,359,170, 2,847,596, AND 3,070,047.

SN 77-017,420, FILED 10-10-2006.

LESLIE RICHARDS, EXAMINING ATTORNEY



Director of the United States Putent and Trademark Office

EXHIBIT C

Int. Cl.: 9

Prior U.S. Cls.: 21, 23, 26, 36, and 38

Reg. No. 2,847,596

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Registered June 1, 2004

TRADEMARK PRINCIPAL REGISTER

MAXXBASS

WAVES AUDIO LTD. (ISRAEL COMPANY) 23 KALISHER STREET TEL-AVIV, ISRAEL 65165

FOR: SOFTWARE AND ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT FOR PROCESSING, TRANSMITTING, RE-CEIVING AND REPRODUCING AUDIO SIGNALS IN ORDER TO ENHANCE BASS QUALITIES, NAMELY, DIGITAL AUDIO WORK STATIONS CONSISTING OF COMPUTER HARDWARE AND SOFTWARE FOR REPRODUCING AUDIO SIG-NALS IN ORDER TO ENHANCE BASS QUALITIES; DIGITAL AND ANALOG MIXING CONSOLES; DI-GITAL AND ANALOG RACK-MOUNT PROCES-SING EQUIPMENT, NAMELY, AUDIO SIGNAL PROCESSORS; AUDIO PROCESSING EQUIPMENT, NAMELY, COMPUTER HARDWARE FOR BROAD-CASTING AND GLOBAL COMPUTER NETWORK TRANSMISSION AND COMMUNICATIONS SOFT-WARE USED TO ACCESS AND TRANSMIT AUDIO INFORMATION FROM WEBSITES ON A GLOBAL COMPUTER NETWORK; HOME AUDIO APPLIAN- CES, NAMELY, RADIOS, TELEVISION SETS, CD PLAYERS, AUDIO CASSETTE PLAYERS, STEREO SYSTEMS, MINI STEREO SYSTEMS CONSISTING OF AUDIO AMPLIFIERS, TUNERS, RECEIVERS, CD AND AUDIO TAPE PLAYERS; AND VIDEO CASSETTE PLAYERS; PORTABLE AUDIO APPLIANCES, NAMELY, RADIOS, CD PLAYERS, MINIDISK PLAYERS AND MP3 PLAYERS; MAGNETIC AND OPTICAL MEDIA CARRYING AUDIO SIGNALS THAT WERE SUBJECT TO BASS ENHANCEMENT, NAMELY, RECORDS, CD'S, AUDIO TAPES, MINIDISK FEATURING MUSICAL SOUND RECORDINGS; DOWNLOADABLE BASS ENHANCED MP3 AUDIO FILES FEATURING MUSICAL SOUND RECORDINGS, IN CLASS 9 (U.S. CLS. 21, 23, 26, 36 AND 38).

FIRST USE 9-0-1997; IN COMMERCE 9-0-1997.

SN 75-469,498, FILED 4-17-1998.

MARY BOAGNI, EXAMINING ATTORNEY

EXHIBIT D

Int. Cl.: 9

Prior U.S. Cls.: 21, 23, 26, 36, and 38

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Reg. No. 3,612,855 Registered Apr. 28, 2009

TRADEMARK
PRINCIPAL REGISTER

MAXXVOLUME

WAVES AUDIO LTD. (ISRAEL CORPORATION) AZRIELI CENTER, TRIANGLE TOWER, 32ND FLR 132 DERECH PETACH-TIKVA TEL AVIV, ISRAEL 67021

FOR: SOFTWARE FOR PROCESSING, TRANS-MITTING, RECEIVING AND REPRODUCING AUDIO SIGNALS IN ORDER TO ENHANCE BASS QUALITIES FOR A NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS, NAMELY, FOR MIXING AND MASTERING AUDIO SIGNALS FOR REPRODUCTION, BROADCASTING, POST-PRODUCTION, PODCASTING AND INTERNET STREAMING, FOR AUDIO PROCESSING AND LEVELING OF VOICEOVERS, VOCALS, AND INSTRUMENTAL TRACKS, AND FOR CONTROLLING THE DYNAMIC RANGE OF AUDIO SIGNALS; DIGITAL AND ANALOG AUDIO MIXING CONSOLES; DIGITAL AND ANALOG AUDIO RACK-MOUNT PROCESSING EQUIPMENT, NAMELY, AUDIO SIGNAL PROCESSORS; AUDIO PROCESSING EQUIPMENT, NAMELY, COMPU-

TER HARDWARE FOR BROADCASTING AND GLOBAL COMPUTER NETWORK TRANSMISSION AND COMMUNICATIONS SOFTWARE USED TO ACCESS AND TRANSMIT AUDIO INFORMATION FROM WEBSITES ON A GLOBAL COMPUTER NETWORK, IN CLASS 9 (U.S. CLS. 21, 23, 26, 36 AND 38).

FIRST USE 4-30-2007; IN COMMERCE 4-30-2007.

THE MARK CONSISTS OF STANDARD CHARACTERS WITHOUT CLAIM TO ANY PARTICULAR FONT, STYLE, SIZE, OR COLOR.

OWNER OF U.S. REG. NOS. 2,847,596 AND 3,070,047.

SN 77-017,443, FILED 10-10-2006.

STEVEN R. FOSTER, EXAMINING ATTORNEY

EXHIBIT E

PTO Form 1478 (Rev 9/2006) OMB No. 0651-0009 (Exp 11/30/2008)

Trademark/Service Mark Application, Principal Register

Serial Number: 85792643 Filing Date: 12/03/2012

The table below presents the data as entered.

Input Field	Entered					
SERIAL NUMBER	85792643					
MARK INFORMATION						
*MARK	MAXX					
STANDARD CHARACTERS	YES					
USPTO-GENERATED IMAGE	YES					
LITERAL ELEMENT	MAXX					
MARK STATEMENT	The mark consists of standard characters, without claim to any particular font, style, size, or color.					
REGISTER	Principal					
APPLICANT INFORMATION						
*OWNER OF MARK	Motorola Trademark Holdings, LLC					
*STREET	600 N. U.S. Highway 45					
*CITY	Libertyville					
*STATE (Required for U.S. applicants)	Illinois					
*COUNTRY	United States					
*ZIP/POSTAL CODE (Required for U.S. applicants only)	60048					
EMAIL ADDRESS	mxg674@motorola.com					
LEGAL ENTITY INFORMATION						
ТУРЕ	limited liability company					
STATE/COUNTRY WHERE LEGALLY ORGANIZED	Delaware					
GOODS AND/OR SERVICES AND BA						

INTERNATIONAL CLASS	009
*IDENTIFICATION	Mobile phones, smartphones, and accessories therefor, namely, power adapters
FILING BASIS	SECTION 1(b)
ATTORNEY INFORMATION	
NAME	William R. Anderson
ATTORNEY DOCKET NUMBER	MTH1002375
FIRM NAME	Motorola Trademark Holdings, LLC
STREET	600 N. U.S. Highway 45
CITY	Libertyville
STATE	Illinois
COUNTRY	United States
ZIP/POSTAL CODE	60048
EMAIL ADDRESS	mxg674@motorola.com
AUTHORIZED TO COMMUNICATE VIA EMAIL	Yes
OTHER APPOINTED ATTORNEY	David C. Carroll and all other attorneys of the firm
CORRESPONDENCE INFORMATION	
NAME	William R. Anderson
FIRM NAME	Motorola Trademark Holdings, LLC
STREET	600 N. U.S. Highway 45
CITY	Libertyville
STATE	Illinois
COUNTRY	United States
ZIP/POSTAL CODE	60048
EMAIL ADDRESS	mxg674@motorola.com
AUTHORIZED TO COMMUNICATE VIA EMAIL	Yes
FEE INFORMATION	approximation of the second of
NUMBER OF CLASSES	1
FEE PER CLASS	325
*TOTAL FEE DUE	325

DATE SIGNED	12/03/2012
SIGNATORY'S POSITION	Director and Lead Counsel
SIGNATORY'S NAME	David C. Carroll
SIGNATURE	/dcc/
SIGNATURE INFORMATION	* transfer of the second of th
*TOTAL FEE PAID	325

PTO Form 1478 (Rev 9/2006)

OMB No. 0651-0009 (Exp 11/30/2008)

Trademark/Service Mark Application, Principal Register

Serial Number: 85792643 Filing Date: 12/03/2012

To the Commissioner for Trademarks:

MARK: MAXX (Standard Characters, see <u>mark</u>)
The literal element of the mark consists of MAXX.

The mark consists of standard characters, without claim to any particular font, style, size, or color.

The applicant, Motorola Trademark Holdings, LLC, a limited liability company legally organized under the laws of Delaware, having an address of

600 N. U.S. Highway 45 Libertyville, Illinois 60048 United States

requests registration of the trademark/service mark identified above in the United States Patent and Trademark Office on the Principal Register established by the Act of July 5, 1946 (15 U.S.C. Section 1051 et seq.), as amended, for the following:

International Class 009: Mobile phones, smartphones, and accessories therefor, namely, power adapters

Intent to Use: The applicant has a bona fide intention to use or use through the applicant's related company or licensee the mark in commerce on or in connection with the identified goods and/or services. (15 U.S.C. Section 1051(b)).

The applicant's current Attorney Information:

William R. Anderson and David C. Carroll and all other attorneys of the firm of Motorola Trademark Holdings, LLC

600 N. U.S. Highway 45

Libertyville, Illinois 60048

United States

The attorney docket/reference number is MTH1002375.

The applicant's current Correspondence Information:

William R. Anderson

Motorola Trademark Holdings, LLC

600 N. U.S. Highway 45

Libertyville, Illinois 60048

mxg674@motorola.com (authorized)

A fee payment in the amount of \$325 has been submitted with the application, representing payment for 1

class(es).

Declaration

The undersigned, being hereby warned that willful false statements and the like so made are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both, under 18 U.S.C. Section 1001, and that such willful false statements, and the like, may jeopardize the validity of the application or any resulting registration, declares that he/she is properly authorized to execute this application on behalf of the applicant; he/she believes the applicant to be the owner of the trademark/service mark sought to be registered, or, if the application is being filed under 15 U.S.C. Section 1051(b), he/she believes applicant to be entitled to use such mark in commerce; to the best of his/her knowledge and belief no other person, firm, corporation, or association has the right to use the mark in commerce, either in the identical form thereof or in such near resemblance thereto as to be likely, when used on or in connection with the goods/services of such other person, to cause confusion, or to cause mistake, or to deceive; and that all statements made of his/her own knowledge are true; and that all statements made on information and belief are believed to be true.

Signature: /dcc/ Date Signed: 12/03/2012

Signatory's Name: David C. Carroll

Signatory's Position: Director and Lead Counsel

RAM Sale Number: 11329

RAM Accounting Date: 12/03/2012

Serial Number: 85792643

Internet Transmission Date: Mon Dec 03 09:55:20 EST 2012 TEAS Stamp: USPTO/BAS-144.188.31.2-20121203095520890

263-85792643-4907115676f7965d5ad4e3de3fb 36a8f3-DA-11329-20121203093641691107

MAXX

\$44 (Reva 12/12) Cand rev (1/15/13)

Case3:13-cv-01091-ENGL Decument1streEled03/11/13 Page1 of 3

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the number of initiating the civil docket sheet. OFF INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS WAVES AUDIO LTD	E OF THIS FO	DEFENDANTS MOTOROLA MOBILITY LLC AND MOTOROLA TRADEMARK HOLDINGS, LLC							
` '	of First Listed Plaintiff <u>N/.</u> KCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CA			County of Res		(IN U.S. P.	ed Defendant LAINTIFF CASES ONDEMNATION T OF LAND INVO		
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, A See Attachment	Address, and Telephone Number	r)		C V	-		10	91	EMC
II. BASIS OF JURISTA	CTION (Place an "X" in	One Box Only)	III. CITI	ZENSHIP OF	PRIN	CIPAL	PARTIES (#	Place an "X" in One	e Box for Plaintiff
1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	■ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not	a Party)	·	For Diversity Cases n of This State	Only) PTF	DEF	Incorporated or I	and One Box f Principal Place This State	for Defendant) PTF DEF 4 44
U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of	f Parties in Item III)		n of Another State	□ 2 5 7 1	□ 2	of Business In	Principal Place Another State	□ 5 ⊠ 5
				n or Subject of a eign Country	⊠ 3	3	Foreign Nation		
IV. NATURE OF SUIT				eggy and recognished to a second of the second of the second	t airt ()		hagarina h genero elegan a visió	WINDOWS C. Action and Co.	The second of the second buy to the
□ 110 Insurance □ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment □ 151 Medicare Act □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) □ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits □ 160 Stockholders' Suits □ 190 Other Contract □ 195 Contract Product Liability □ 196 Franchise □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Foreclosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 240 Torts to Land □ 245 Tort Product Liability □ 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle 750 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice 440 Other Civil Rights 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 445 Amer. w/Disabilities Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities Other 448 Education	PERSONAL INJ 365 Personal Injur Product Liabi 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutica Personal Injur Product Liabil 368 Asbestos Pers Injury Produc Liability PERSONAL PROF 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lend 380 Other Persona Property Dam Product Liabil 463 Alien Detaine 510 Motions to Va Sentence 530 General 535 Death Penalty Other: 540 Mandamus & 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Conditi 560 Civil Detainee Conditions of	URY 62: Ty - Solity 690 al y Solity 790 Solity 790 Solity 790 Solity 790 Contact 790 Solity 790 Solit	5 Drug Related Seizu of Property 21 USO Other D Fair Labor Standard Act D Labor/Management Relations Railway Labor Act Earnily and Medical Leave Act Other Labor Litigat Employee Retiremed Income Security Act Naturalization App 6 Other Immigration Actions	ds C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C	423 With 28 U	ral 28 USC 158 drawal ISC 157 Trights Demark (1395ff) 6 Lung (923) C/DIWW (405(g)) 7 Title XVI	375 False C	claims Act eapportionment st and Banking erce ation er Influenced and Corganizations mer Credit Sat TV ies/Commodities/ nge statutory Actions ltural Acts mental Matters m of Information tion istrative Procedure view or Appeal of Decision utionality of
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in ☑ 1 Original ☐ 2 Ren		Confinement	l l4 Reins	stated or 📙 5	Transfe	erred from	∐ 6 Multid	istrict	
	te Court App	ellate Court	Reop	ened	Anothe (specify)	r District	Litigat		
VI. CAUSE OF	Cite the U.S. Civil Statu 15 U.S.C. 1114(1)	te under which you a	are filing (Do	not cite jurisdiction	al statutes	uniess div	ersity):		
ACTION	Brief description of caus Trademark	se:							
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS IS UNDER RULE 23,		ON DI	EMAND \$			HECK YES onl		complaint:
VIII. RELATED CASE IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE				DOCKE	T NUMBER _		
IX. DIVISIONAL ASSI (Place an "X" in One Box Onl DATE March 11, 2013			N FRANC	CISCO/OAKI	LAND(X	SAN JOSE	() EURI	EKA
		1							

Case3:13-cv-01091-EMC Document1-1 Filed03/11/13 Page2 of 3 INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COSER SHEET FORM JS 44

Authority For Civil Cover Sheet

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of pleading or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. The attorney filing a case should complete the form as follows:

- I. (a) Plaintiffs-Defendants. Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.
 - (b) County of Residence. For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)
 - (c) Attorneys. Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".
- II. Jurisdiction. The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.Cv.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below.

 United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here. United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box.

 Federal question. (3) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked.

 Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; NOTE: federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.)
- III. Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties. This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.
- IV. Nature of Suit. Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If the nature of suit cannot be determined, be sure the cause of action, in Section VI below, is sufficient to enable the deputy clerk or the statistical clerk(s) in the Administrative Office to determine the nature of suit. If the cause fits more than one nature of suit, select the most definitive.
- V. Origin. Place an "X" in one of the six boxes.

Original Proceedings. (1) Cases which originate in the United States district courts.

Removed from State Court. (2) Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 U.S.C., Section 1441. When the petition for removal is granted, check this box.

Remanded from Appellate Court. (3) Check this box for cases remanded to the district court for further action. Use the date of remand as the filing date.

Reinstated or Reopened. (4) Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date. Transferred from Another District. (5) For cases transferred under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.

Multidistrict Litigation. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407. When this box is checked, do not check (5) above.

- VI. Cause of Action. Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity. Example: U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC 553 Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service
- VII. Requested in Complaint. Class Action. Place an "X" in this box if you are filing a class action under Rule 23, F.R.Cv.P.

 Demand. In this space enter the actual dollar amount being demanded or indicate other demand, such as a preliminary injunction.

 Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded.
- VIII. Related Cases. This section of the JS 44 is used to reference related pending cases, if any. If there are related pending cases, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judge names for such cases.

Date and Attorney Signature. Date and sign the civil cover sheet.

Case3:13-cv-01091-EMC Document1-1 Filed03/11/13 Page3 of 3

Attachment

Attorney for Plaintiffs WAVES AUDIO LTD., AND WAVES INC.:

J. Scott Denko (Texas State Bar No. 00792457) (Pro Hac Vice Pending) Bradley D. Coburn (Texas State Bar No. 24036377) (Pro Hac Vice Pending) R. Floyd Walker (Texas State Bar No. 24044751) (Pro Hac Vice Pending) Sherri A. Wilson (Texas State Bar No. 24075291) (Pro Hac Vice Pending) DENKO COBURN LAUFF LLP

1501 S. MoPac Expy., Suite A315

Austin, TX 78746

Telephone: (512) 906-2074
Facsimile: (512) 906-2075
Email: denko@dcllegal.com
coburn@dcllegal.com
walker@dcllegal.com
wilson@dcllegal.com

Perry R. Clark (California Bar No. 197101) LAW OFFICES OF PERRY R. CLARK 825 San Antonio Road Palo Alto, CA 94303 Telephone: (650) 248-5817

Telephone: (650) 248-5817 Facsimile: (650) 618-8533

Email: perry@perryclarklaw.com